



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/029,667	10/22/2001	Joshua Miles Chase	CIS01-05(3847)	5068
58406 7590 03/26/2008 BARRY W. CHAPIN, ESQ. CHAPIN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW, LLC WESTBOROUGH OFFICE PARK 1700 WEST PARK DRIVE WESTBOROUGH, MA 01581				
EXAMINER				
CHANKONG, DOHIM				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2152				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/26/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/029,667

Applicant(s)

CHASE ET AL.

Examiner

DOHM CHANKONG

Art Unit

2152

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 19-29, 37, 38 and 40-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 19-29, 37, 38, and 40-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

- 1> This action is in response to Applicant's amendment and arguments filed on 1.18.2008. Claim 19 is amended. Claims 1-11 and 39 are cancelled. Claims 43-54 are added. Claims 19-29, 37, 38, and 40-54 are presented for further examination.
- 2> This is a final rejection.

Response to Arguments

3> As to the independent claims, Applicant argues that the cited references fail to disclose providing redirection information which indicates an identity of secondary content to be accessed by the requesting device. Specifically, with respect to Merriman, Applicant argues that Merriman provides the requesting device with the location of an advertisement server which is responsible for determining the identity of the secondary content. Applicant's argument has been carefully considered but are not persuasive because all three references teach the claimed limitation.

Merriman's teaching is not limited to simply returning the location of the advertisement as Applicant asserts. Merriman discloses providing the location of the advertising server as well as "information about the page on which the advertisement will be displayed" [column 3 «lines 36-38»]. This information includes well known " tag" which identifies "an inline image such as a banner" [column 3 «lines 39-41»]. Merriman's teaching of providing a link that identifies the location of the server as well as the advertisements to be displayed read on Applicant's claimed limitation.

Additionally, both Thompson and Blumenau disclose the claimed limitation. For example, Thompson discloses a server that delivers links to the requesting device [0035]. The links identify secondary content and therefore this teaching reads on Applicant's claimed limitation for providing an identity of the secondary content to be accessed by the requesting device. Similarly, Blumenau discloses that handoff instructions can be sent directly to the requesting device (instead of the proxy content device) for the purpose of maintaining the security of the requesting device [column 12 «lines 2-17»]. The requesting device then accesses the content through the handoff instructions.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant's arguments are not found persuasive. All three cited references teach the claimed limitation. Therefore, the rejection of the independent claims are maintained as set forth in the previous action.

4> As to dependent claim 25, Applicant argues that none of the cited references teach redirection information comprising a second redirection command operable by the requesting device to allow the requesting device to access the initial content from the initial content source. As discussed above, Blumenau is not limited to providing handoff instructions between the primary and proxy content providing sites. Blumenau discloses providing the handoff instructions directly to the requesting device [column 12 «lines 12-14»]. Blumenau's handoff instructions provide the identity of content to be accessed by the requesting device [column 12 «lines 14-17»].

Based on the foregoing, Applicant's arguments are not found persuasive. Blumenau teaches the claimed limitation. The rejection of the dependent claims are maintained as set forth in the previous action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5> Claims 19-29, 37, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blumenau (U.S. Patent Number 6,505,240) in view of Merriman et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,948,061), hereinafter referred to as Merriman, further in view of Thompson et al, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002|0077900 ["Thompson"].

6> Blumenau disclosed a system for providing different sets of content from a content providing site to content display sites using a plurality of proxy content providing sites. In an analogous art, Merriman disclosed a method for targeting the delivery of advertisements over a network where content is delivered from one web server and an advertisement is delivered from a separate advertising web server. Also in an analogous art, Thompson disclosed a method for providing advertising content independent of requested content.

7> Concerning claims 19, 37, and 38, Blumenau uses handoff instructions in order to effectuate content provision from a providing site to a display site. These instructions, or redirection information, are mainly sent from the primary providing site to the proxy providing sites. Thus, Blumenau has not explicitly disclosed providing the redirection information to the requesting device. Instead, Blumenau's primary providing site, which intercepts the request, passes instructions directly to other providing sites. However, providing the redirection information to the requesting device was well known in the art as evidenced by Merriman whose content server provides the redirection command back to the client device so that the appropriate advertising server may be accessed.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system of Blumenau by adding the ability for providing the redirection information to the requesting device as provided by Merriman. Here the combination satisfies the need for a content provision system that enables providers to tailor the content being provided in accordance with characteristics of anticipated observers. See Blumenau, column 2, lines 23-28.

8> Concerning claim 19, Blumenau did not explicitly disclose the secondary content condition as a change in root level domains between the initial request and former requests. However, tracking domains and using this information in determining secondary content was well known in the art as evidenced by Merriman whose system utilizes domain information in determining and accessing secondary content.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system of Blumenau by adding the ability to use the secondary content condition as a change in root level domains between the initial request and former requests as provided by Merriman. Again the combination satisfies the need for a content provision system that enables providers to tailor the content being provided in accordance with characteristics of anticipated observers. See Blumenau, column 2, lines 23-28. It is also noted here that the applicant has admitted that detecting a change in root level domains between an initial request and former requests was well known in the art to one of ordinary skill. See page 13, second paragraph, of the remarks filed 7/9/2007.

9> Concerning claims 19, 37, and 38, the combination of Blumenau and Merriman did not explicitly disclose intercepting the content request prior to the request arriving at an intended destination. However, it was well known in the art that such intercepting and manipulation may be done by a separate server or device in the network. This is evidenced by Thompson whose system utilizes an interceptor separate from content providers in order to examine information requests from users before they reach the content provider. Upon intercepting the requests, Thompson's interceptor provides related advertising content independent of the requested content.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the combination of Blumenau and Merriman by adding the ability to intercept the content request prior to the request arriving at an intended destination as provided by Thompson. Thereby, the advertising or secondary content can be delivered

independently of the requested content. Here, the combination satisfies the need enhancing the likelihood that a user will view an advertisement [Thompson, 0008 | 0034].

10> Some claims will be discussed together. Those claims which are essentially the same except that they set forth the claimed invention as a communications device or a computer program product are rejected under the same rationale applied to the described claim.

11> Thereby, the combination of Blumenau, Merriman, and Thompson discloses:

- <Claims 19, 37, and 38>

A communicative device for delivering content, the method comprising:

a memory, a communications interface, a processor, and an interconnection mechanism coupling the memory, the processor, and the communications interface [Blumenau, column 4 «lines 31-34» : memory, communications interface, processor and interconnection are all inherent elements in a digital computer];

wherein the processor is configured to:

intercept, from a requesting device, an initial request for initial content prior to the initial request arriving at an intended destination, the initial content accessible at an intended destination comprising an initial content source (Thompson, 0034);

in response to intercept the initial request: creating redirection information indicating an identity of secondary content to be accessed by the requesting device in addition to the initial content in the initial request (Blumenau, column 4, lines 9-14; column 6, lines 23-31; and column 7, lines 31-42); and

provide the redirection information to the requesting device (Blumenau, column 9, lines 45-49 and Merriman, column 3, lines 35-44), such that the requesting device accesses both the secondary content from the secondary content source as well as the initial content from the initial content source (Blumenau, column 7, lines 43-53); and

detect an occurrence of a secondary content condition in the redirection information, the secondary content condition indicating a requirement for presentation of secondary content to the requesting device, such that the requesting device accessing the secondary content after occurrence of the secondary content condition (Blumenau, column 9, lines 20-49 where the content condition would be present in a handoff instruction which would then effectuate content provision steps as previously discussed), wherein the secondary content condition comprises a detection of a change in root level domains between the initial request and former requests (Merriman, column 5, lines 34-63).

- <Claim 20>

The device of claim 19 further comprising the steps of:
transmitting the secondary content to the requesting device from the secondary content source; and transmitting the initial content to the requesting device from the initial content source (Blumenau, column 7, lines 43-53).

- <Claim 21>

The device of claim 20 wherein the secondary content contains a reference to the identity of the initial content, such that when the requesting device receives the

secondary content in response to the step of transmitting the secondary content to the requesting device, the requesting device can invoke the reference to the identity of the initial content in order to access the initial content causing performance of the step of transmitting the initial content to the requesting device (Blumenau, column 9, line 36 through column 10, line 6).

- <Claim 22>

The device of claim 20 wherein the steps of transmitting the secondary content to the requesting device and transmitting the initial content to the requesting device occur in relation to each such that the requesting device has concurrent access to the secondary content in addition to the initial content (Blumenau, column 7, lines 43-53).

- <Claim 23>

The device of claim 19, wherein:

the redirection information includes a redirection command operable by the requesting device (Blumenau, column 9, lines 36-49); and

wherein the redirection command includes the identity of secondary content causing the requesting device, in response to the step of providing, to access the secondary content from the secondary content source (Blumenau, column 9, lines 25-28).

- <Claim 24>

The device of claim 23 wherein the redirection command further comprises the identity of the initial content specified by the initial request, such that when the requesting device operates the redirection command, the secondary content source

receives the identity of the initial content specified in the redirection command and causes the requesting device to receive the both the secondary content and the initial content (Blumenau, column 9, line 50 through column 10, line 6 where the timing instructions allow primary and secondary content to be related to each other, such as the secondary content being displayed between breaks in the primary content).

- <Claim 25>

The device of claim 19, wherein:

the redirection information comprises a first redirection command operable by the requesting device and including the identity of secondary content and wherein the step of providing includes a first step of providing to provide the first redirection command to the requesting device to allow the requesting device to access the secondary content from the secondary content source (Blumenau, column 9, lines 8-19); and

wherein the redirection information further comprises a second redirection command operable by the requesting device and including the identity of initial content and wherein the step of providing includes a second step of providing to provide the second redirection command to the requesting device to allow the requesting device to access the initial content from the initial content source (Blumenau, column 9, lines 8-19 where multiple handoff instructions to different proxy content providing sites represent a multiplicity of redirection commands).

- <Claim 26>

The device of claim 25 wherein the communications device performs a step of providing a delay between the first and second steps of providing, such that the requesting device receives the secondary content in response to operating the first redirection command and then receives the initial content in response to operating the second redirection command at a time at least equal to the delay between the first and second steps of providing (Blumenau, column 7, lines 54-63 where the delay is represented by specific timing instructions that allow the primary and secondary content to be synchronized).

- <Claim 27>

The device of claim 19, wherein:

the redirection information includes a framework operable by the requesting device; and wherein the method of providing the redirection information further comprises the steps of: providing the secondary content to the framework such that the requesting device can access the secondary content; and providing the initial content to the framework such that the requesting device can access the initial content subsequent to accessing the secondary content (Blumenau, column 9, line 50 through column 10, line 9).

- <Claim 28>

The device of claim 19 wherein the step of creating redirection information comprises the steps of: extracting request criteria from the initial request; and selecting the identity of secondary content based from a plurality of identities of

secondary content based upon the request criteria, such that the secondary content accessible by the requesting device is dependant upon the request criteria of the initial request (Blumenau, column 10, lines 10-24).

- <Claim 29>

The device of claim 18 wherein the secondary content is advertising and wherein the step of extracting and selecting are performed to select secondary content for targeted advertising presentation to the requesting device (Blumenau, column 7, lines 38-42 and column 8, lines 8-17).

Since the combination of Blumenau, Merriman, and Thompson discloses all of the above limitations, claims 19-29, 37, and 38 are rejected.

12> Claims 40-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blumenau in view of Merriman in view of Thompson, as applied above, further in view of Subramaniam et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,081,900), hereinafter referred to as Subramaniam.

13> The combination of Blumenau, Merriman, and Thompson disclosed a system for providing different sets of content from a content providing site to content display sites using a plurality of proxy content providing sites, which system can target the delivery of advertisements. In an analogous art, Subramaniam disclosed a system for providing both secure and non-secure content from a target server to an external client in a secure fashion using a proxy server.

14> Concerning claim 40, the combination of Blumenau, Merriman, and Thomson did not explicitly disclose that the redirection command includes addresses of both the secondary and initial content, a name of the initial content, and a delimiter as recited in the claims. However, this format was well known in the art as evidenced by Subramanian's redirection command which includes all of these characteristics as claimed.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the combination of Blumenau, Merriman, and Thompson by adding the ability for the redirection command to include addresses of both the secondary and initial content, a name of the initial content, and a delimiter as provided by Subramaniam. Here the combination satisfies the need for a content provision system that enables providers to tailor the content being provided in accordance with characteristics of anticipated observers. See Blumenau, column 2, lines 23-28.

15> Concerning claims 41 and 42, the combination of Blumenau, Merriman, and Thompson did not explicitly disclose generating a key based on information related to the initial request and sending the key to the content source to allow the content source to access the information related to the initial request. However, the use of keys in this way was well known in the art as evidenced by Subramaniam's authentication techniques.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the combination of Blumenau, Merriman, and Thompson by adding the ability to generate a key based on information related to the initial request and sending the key to the content source to allow the content source to access the information

related to the initial request as provided by Subramaniam. Again the combination satisfies the need for a content provision system that enables providers to tailor the content being provided in accordance with characteristics of anticipated observers. See Blumenau, column 2, lines 23-28.

16> Thereby, the combination of Blumenau, Merriman, Thompson, and Subramaniam discloses:

- <Claim 40>

The method of claim 23 wherein the redirection command including the identity of secondary content includes: (i) an address of the secondary content, the address of secondary content representing a location of the secondary content source; (ii) a name of the initial content; (iii) an address of the initial content, the address of the initial content representing a location of the initial content source; and (iv) a delimiter separating the address of the secondary content from the name of the initial content and the address of the initial content (Subramaniam, column 7, lines 1-67).

- <Claims 41 and 42>

The computer program product of claim 37 wherein said intercepting, from a requesting device, an initial request for initial content accessible from an initial content source further comprises generating a key based on information related to the initial request and sending the key to the content source to allow the content source to access the information related to the initial request (Subramaniam, column 12, lines 33-46).

Art Unit: 2152

Since the combination of Blumenau, Merriman, Thompson, and Subramaniam discloses all of the above limitations, claims 40-42 are rejected.

17> Claims 43, 48-50, and 52-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmid et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,438,578 [“Schmid”].

18> Schmid was cited in the PTO-892 with the previous Office action.

19> As to claims 43 and 54, Schmid discloses a method in a communications device for delivering content, the method comprising the steps of:

maintaining access to a plurality of second content addresses, each second content address identifying secondary content located at a respective secondary content source [column 6 «lines 41-56»];

prior to an initial request for initial content made by a requesting device arriving at an intended destination, the intended destination comprising an initial content source [Figure 1 «items 14, 24, 12» | column 10 «lines 17-21»]:

intercepting the initial request [Figure 1 «item 24» | column 9 «lines 65-67»

where : interception means intercepts a packet intended for the requested information source | column 10 «lines 17-21»];

creating redirection information by processing at least one request criteria extracted from the intercepted initial request to determine an identity of secondary content to be retrieved by the requesting device [column 6 «lines 48-50» where :

Schmid does not expressly disclose extracting request criteria. However, Schmid discloses that the advertisements are "related in some way to the requested information." This teaching implies extracting from the requested information some criteria in order to retrieve the related advertisements]; and

transmitting the redirection information to the requesting device [column 6 «lines 41-44» : instructions cause the client to request the supplemental information].

20> As to claim 48, Schmid discloses creating redirection information includes:

concatenating a first redirection code and at least one second redirection code; the first redirection code operable to instruct the requesting device to reinitiate retrieval of the initial content; the at least second redirection code operable to instruct the requesting device to initiate retrieval of the second content [column 6 «lines 8-28 and 41-44» where : Schmid's request instructions for the requested information and the supplemental information read on Applicant's redirection code];

including a delimiter separating the first redirection code and the redirection code [column 6 «lines 8-28 and 41-44» where : Schmid does not expressly disclose a delimiter. However, a delimiter is merely a character or series of characters to mark a boundary between regions in a data stream such as a within a packet. Delimiters are well known in the art and are necessary to enable a requesting device to differentiate between the request instructions for the requested information and the supplemental information. Therefore, a delimiter separating the codes is implied].

Art Unit: 2152

21> As to claim 49, Schmid discloses:

including an address of the initial content source in the first redirection code [column 5 «lines 28-35»; and

including an address of the at least one secondary content source in the second redirection code [column 6 «lines 41-47»].

22> As to claim 50, Schmid discloses:

providing a command to the requesting device via the redirection information to concurrently retrieve the initial content during retrieval of the secondary content [column 6 «lines 8-28 and 41-44» : the format and request instructions cause the requesting device to request both the requested and supplemental information].

23> As to claim 52, Schmid discloses:

determining the identity of the secondary content relative to at least one of a geographic indication, a source indication, and a content indication in the at least one request criteria extracted from the intercepted initial request [column 6 «lines 48-50»].

24> As to claim 53, Schmid discloses intercepting the initial request at an entry point to the Internet [Figure 1 «item 10»].

25> Claims 44-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmid, in view of Bandera et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,332,127 [“Bandera”].

26> As to claim 44, Schmid does not expressly disclose extracting the at least one request criteria from at least one protocol header and matching the extracted request criteria to at least one of the plurality of secondary content addresses. However, such a feature was well known in the art at the time of Applicant's invention. For example, Bandera the claimed features. Specifically, Bandera discloses extracting a request criteria from the least one protocol header on the intercepted initial request [column 6 «lines 57-60» | column 7 «lines 9-17» : location information is conveyed within the HTTP header]. Bandera also discloses matching the at least one extracted requested criteria to at least one of the plurality of secondary content addresses [column 7 «lines 20-27» : plurality of advertising objects that are mapped to location information].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Schmid to include the extraction and matching functionality as taught in Bandera. One would have been motivated to adapt Schmid as Bandera teaches that such functionality provides the ability to provide relevant advertisements to a user based on the extracted criteria (location).

27> As to claim 45, Schmid does not expressly disclose the matching feature in claim 44 further includes determining desirable secondary content by identifying at least one of the plurality of secondary content addresses that maps to content related to the at least one extracted request criteria or capturing an address from the at least one of the plurality of

secondary content addresses. However, these features were well known in the art at the time of Applicant's invention.

Bandera discloses both:

determining desirable secondary content by identifying at least one of the plurality of secondary content addresses that maps to content related to the at least one extracted request criteria [column 7 «lines 24-27»: lookup table with associations between advertising objects and location information]; and

capturing an address from the at least one of the plurality of secondary content addresses that maps to content related to the at least one extracted request criteria [column 7 «lines 28-40»].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Schmid with Bandera's teachings of identifying secondary content addresses that are mapped to the requests in order to tailor the secondary content to user interests. One would have been motivated to adapt Schmid as Bandera teaches that such functionality provides the ability to provide relevant advertisements to a user based on the extracted criteria (location).

28> As to claim 46, Schmid does not expressly disclose identifying at least one of the plurality of secondary content addresses including at least one of identifying content based on a source, geographic, or content indication related to the at least one extracted request criteria.

Bandera discloses identifying content that has at least one geographic indication related to at least one geographic location of the communications device or from the at least

one extracted request criteria [column 7 «lines 32-40»]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Schmid with Bandera's teachings of identifying secondary content addresses related to the geographic location of the communications device. One would have been motivated to adapt Schmid as Bandera teaches that such functionality provides the ability to provide relevant advertisements to a user based on the extracted criteria (location).

29> As to claim 47, Schmid discloses capturing at least one Internet address for at least one advertisement that is related to the at least one extracted request criteria, the at least one advertisement programmed to be displayed with respect to a display of the initial content [column 6 «lines 48-50» where : Schmid does not expressly disclose extracting request criteria. However, Schmid discloses that the advertisements are "related in some way to the requested information." This teaching implies extracting from the requested information some criteria in order to retrieve the related advertisements]. Also, see Bandera [column 7 «lines 15-27»].

30> Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmid, in view of Subramaniam.

31> Schmid does not expressly disclose providing to a delimiter to be detected by the requesting device, such detection indicating to the requesting device an existence of a secondary content condition. However, such a feature was well known in the art at the time

Art Unit: 2152

of Applicant's invention. For example, Subramaniam discloses providing a delimiter to be detected by the requesting device, such detection indicating to the requesting device an existence of a secondary content condition [column 7 «lines 12-20 and 47-58»]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Schmid's system to include the delimiter feature as taught in Subramaniam. Subramaniam discloses that the delimiter enables two different URLs to be sent as a single URL.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DOHM CHANKONG whose telephone number is (571)272-3942. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday [8:30 AM to 4:30 PM].

Art Unit: 2152

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571.272.3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/D. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 2152

/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2152